

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Ramin Hatam,

Complainant,

vs.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902E),

Defendant.

Case 15-02-021
(Filed February 24, 2015)**ORDER EXTENDING STATUTORY DEADLINE****Summary**

This decision extends the statutory deadline in these proceeding to August 24, 2016.

1. Background

Public Utilities Code Section 1701.2(e) provides that adjudicatory cases shall be resolved within 12 months of the date that they are initiated unless the Commission makes findings as to why that deadline cannot be met and issues an order extending that deadline. This matter has been categorized as adjudicatory, and the 12-month deadline for resolving this proceeding has been extended to August 24, 2016.

On February 24, 2014, Mr. Ramin Hatam (Complainant), filed a complaint against San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E or Defendant), alleging that: (1) complainant and his family moved into a house about “4 ½ years ago”; (2) at

an unspecified time, the family began experiencing physical symptoms attributed to excessive Electric and Magnetic Field (EMF) emissions from the overhead and underground distribution circuits near the house; (3) the excessive EMF is allegedly caused by an improperly-executed underground conversion undertaken 2005-2007 pursuant to the City of San Diego's underground conversion program; (4) complainant and his family have been forced to vacate the house because of the excessive EMF emissions, and (5) after much communication with, and on-site visits by SDG&E personnel, SDG&E declined to relocate the nearby distribution facilities at its expense.¹

A Prehearing Conference (PHC) was held on June 1, 2015. At the PHC the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ordered the parties to prepare, file and serve post PHC briefs. SDG&E filed its post PHC brief on June 19, 2015. Mr. Hatam filed his brief on June 25, 2015, and SDG&E filed a reply on June 26. The issues raised at the PHC and in the post PHC briefs vis a vis Complainant, SDG&E and the City of San Diego have been reviewed. It is anticipated that the proceeding can and will be concluded with a six-month extension.

2. Waiver of Comment Period

Under Rule 14.6(c)(4) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Commission may reduce or waive the period for public review and comment of proposed decisions extending the deadline for resolving adjudicatory proceedings. Accordingly, pursuant to this rule, the otherwise applicable period for public review and comment is waived.

¹ SDG&E Answer to Complaint, pg. 2

3. Assignment of Proceeding

Liane M. Randolph is the assigned Commissioner and W. Anthony Colbert is the assigned ALJ and presiding officer in this proceeding.

Finding of Fact

1. An extension of time until August 24, 2016 is necessary to allow for the ALJ to complete his Presiding Officer's Decision, and in the event of an appeal, for the Commission to approve the final decision in this complaint case.

Conclusions of Law

1. The deadline for resolving this proceeding should be extended until August 24, 2016.
2. This decision should be effective immediately.

IT IS ORDERED that the statutory deadline for completion of this complain case is extended to August 24, 2016.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.